

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Applicant thanks Examiner for a thorough examination.

The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-20, 21-26, 28-29, 31-32 and 34-36 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 35 are amended herein
- No claims are canceled herein

Support for claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure at least at pages 36-37.

CITED DOCUMENTS

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Abjanic:** Abjanic, U.S. Patent No. 6,732,175
- **Bau:** Bau et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,356,803

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §101

Claims 11-20, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-patentable subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant traverses the statement of the Office. The Office states that “the claim element “computer readable storage medium”, when given its broadest reasonable

interpretation, may include transitory media such as signal or carrier wave, resulting in the claimed invention to be directed to non-patentable subject matter.” (Office Action, page 4) The specification states that “computer readable media may comprise computer storage media and communication media. Computer storage media includes volatile and nonvolatile, removable and non-removable media implemented in any method or technology for storage of information.” (Specification, paragraph [0023]) The specification further states that “[c]ommunication media typically embodies computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules or other data in a modulated data signal such as a carrier wave or other transport mechanism and includes any information delivery media.” (Specification, paragraph [0024]) As the specification describes, computer readable media includes both computer storage media and communication media. However, the fact is that computer storage media is distinguished from communication media with communication media being defined as including a carrier wave. Independent claims 11 and 35 both recite “computer readable storage medium” which excludes carrier waves and other transitory media from the claims by definition. Claims 12-20 and 36 depend from claims 11 and 35. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the claim rejections under §101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER § 102

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(e) as being anticipated by Abjanic.

Claims 2, 6, 10, 12, 16, 20, 22, 26, 30, 32 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Abjanic in view of Bau.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, Applicant herein amends the independent claims, as shown above and discussed below. Independent claim 1 incorporates subject matter from the specification on at least pages 36-37.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for open content model Web service messaging in a networked computing environment, the method comprising (amended text is underlined):

- generating a transport neutral message comprising message recipient information, endpoint addressing information, and one or more reference properties comprising selectively opaque message context, a portion of the selectively opaque context directs a message recipient as to how to handle one or more messages sent to the endpoint in a session;
- binding the transport neutral message to a transport protocol for communication to the message recipient; and
- wherein at least a portion of the selectively opaque message context is not directed to the message recipient, the portion not directed to the message recipient being sent to one or more entities within a service.

Abjanic is directed to “a network apparatus [that] is provided between a network and a plurality of processing nodes or servers. The network apparatus includes a content based message director (e.g., XML director) to route or direct messages received from the network to one of the processing nodes based upon the application data.” (Abjanic, Abstract) Abjanic further states

the director 145 (FIG. 1) parses all or part of the application data (the XML data in this example) and can check to ensure that the XML document or application is well formed (i.e. checks to make sure at least a portion of the XML document meets the so-called well formedness constraints or requirements in the XML specification or standard). Parsing generally refers to the process of categorizing the characters or XML data that make up the XML document as either markup (e.g., <To>) or character data (e.g., bookstore.com). At block 220 of FIG. 2, the application data or XML data (including markup characters and/or character data is then compared to one or more configuration patterns or queries...to determine if there is a match...At block 225, if there is a match between the content of the application data (e.g., the business transaction information which may be provided as XML data) of a message and a configuration pattern or query, the the director 145 directs or switches the message to the corresponding server (or processing node) in the data center (e.g. directed to the specific server, as indicated by the configuration pattern). If there are multiple matches, the director 145 can just direct the message based to the first match, or a load balancing policy can be used to balance messages among a group of servers...In this respect, the director 145 may also act as a filter to selectively pass or forward some messages while blocking others, based upon the application data.

(Abjanic, Col. 6, line 39 through Col. 7, line12)

Abjanic uses the parsing operation to check that the XML document is well formed and properly characterized. Once this is done, it is compared to configuration patterns to determine if there is a match. If there is a match, the director switches the message to the proper server or processing node. However,

Abjanic does not disclose that “the portion not directed to the message recipient [is] sent to one or more entities within a service,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. Instead of a director directing the message itself, the operation looks for a match when performing a comparison between the data and configuration patterns and sends the message to the corresponding server based on the match. However, the opaque context portion of the message in amended claim 1 is transmitted such that part of the message itself is directed to the message recipient and the other part of the same message is directed to other entities within the service. This is not the same as Abjanic where the message is not delivered partially to one entity and partially to another.

Consequently, Abjanic does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 4-5 and 7-9 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 31 stands rejected as allegedly being anticipated over Abjanic. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejection, Applicant has amended this claim in a manner similar to independent claim 1 discussed above. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to

claim 1, Abjanic does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 34 depends from claim 31 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 31 apply equally to this claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 35 stands rejected as allegedly being anticipated over Abjanic. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection, Applicant has amended this claim in a manner similar to independent claim 1 discussed above. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Abjanic does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 36 depends from claim 35 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 35 apply equally to this claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER § 103

Claims 2, 6, 10-16, 18-19, 21-26, 28-29 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Abjanic in view of Bau.

Dependent claims 2, 6, and 10 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 11 apply equally to these claims. These claims also stand rejected under an additional reference, Bau. Bau is specifically cited for its disclosure of “message source” in dependent claim 22 and SOAP in claim 26. (Office Action, page 10) However, Bau fails to remedy the deficiencies of Abjanic discussed above with respect to claim 1. Specifically, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest “the portion not directed to the message recipient [is] sent to one or more entities within a service,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 11, as amended, recites a computer-readable storage medium comprising computer-program instructions for open content model Web service messaging in a networked computing environment, the computer-program instructions being executable by a processor for (amended text is underlined):

- generating, by a processor, a transport neutral message comprising message recipient information, endpoint addressing information, and one or more reference properties comprising selectively opaque message context, the addressing information and selectively opaque message context are respectfully specified by an endpoint reference and message information headers, the message information headers further comprising a reply to property identifying an intended

recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message, a relates to property that indicates how the transport neutral message relates to a different transport neutral message, at least one of the one or more reference properties to ensure that the reply contains additional information to provide one or more functions related to a sender's implementation and a fault to property that is used to send one or more responses to a specific entity when there is a fault associated with the message;

- binding, by a processor, the transport neutral message to a transport protocol for communication to the message recipient; and
- wherein at least a portion of the selectively opaque message context is not directed to the message recipient.

Abjanic does not disclose

a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message, a relates to property that indicates how the transport neutral message relates to a different transport neutral message, at least one of the one or more reference property to ensure that the reply contains additional information to provide one or more functions related to a sender's implementation and a fault to property that is used to send one or more responses to a specific entity when there is a fault associated with the message, as recited in amended claim 11.

As discussed above, Abjanic is directed to “a network apparatus [that] is provided between a network and a plurality of processing nodes or servers.” (Abjanic, Abstract) In rejecting independent claim 11, the Office states that Abjanic does not explicitly disclose that the message information headers further comprise a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message. (Office Action, page 11) Applicant agrees. However, the Office states that Bau discloses an XML based message protocol similar to Abjanic's where the message includes the identifier of a client sending the

message that globally identifies the client such that the server can route the callback to the appropriate client. The Office points to Fig. 4 in Bau as disclosing the “reply to property” and the conversation ID in Bau as disclosing the “relates to property”. (Office Action, page 11) For convenience and clarification, Fig. 4 is reproduced below:

```
<?xml:namespace prefix="s" uri="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/"
xmlns:c="http://openuri.org/soap/conversation/">
  <s:Header>
    <c:conversationID>42332-133214-3223132:42332-3144-2332251</c:conversationID>
    <c:defaultCallbackURL>
      http://original.com/foo/Callbacks.jwt
    </c:defaultCallbackURL>
  </s:Header>
  <s:Body>
    <!-- contents omitted -->
  </s:Body>
</?xml:namespace>
```

FIG. 4

However, Bau does not teach or suggest “at least one of the one or more reference properties to ensure that the reply contains additional information to provide one or more functions related to a sender’s implementation and a fault to property that is used to send one or more responses to a specific entity when there is a fault associated with the message”, as recited in amended claim 11. Bau states “[i]n one embodiment of the invention, one or more of a conversation ID, a default callback location header, and an echoed conversation ID are utilized to maintain conversational state.” (Bau, Col. 10, lines 27-29) Bau does not disclose a reference property and a fault to property. In fact, nowhere in either Abjanic or Bau is reference property or a fault to property disclosed, taught or suggested.

Consequently, Abjanic and Bau do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 12-16 and 18-19 depend from claim 11 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 11 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 21 stands rejected as allegedly being obvious over Abjanic in view of Bau. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection, Applicant has amended this claim in a manner similar to independent claim 11 discussed above. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11, Abjanic and Bau do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 21-26 and 28-29 depend from claim 21 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 21 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 31 appears to have been inadvertently listed under both the §102 rejection and the §103 rejection. Since the claim is discussed in the Office Action under the §102 rejection (see Office Action, page 5) and is not mentioned except in the header under the §103 rejection (see Office Action, page 9), it appears the claim was inadvertently listed in the §103 rejection. Consequently, for the reasons stated above under the §102 section above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 32 depends from claim 31 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 31 apply equally to this claim. Claim 32 also stands rejected under an additional reference, Bau. Bau is specifically cited for its disclosure of “message source” in dependent claim 32. (Office Action, page 11) However, Bau fails to remedy the deficiencies of Abjanic discussed above with respect to claim 31. Specifically, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest “the portion not directed to the message recipient being sent to one or more entities within a service”, as recited in amended claim 31. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

CONCLUSION

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, **Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: September 24, 2010

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff 37,683/
Dale G. Mohlenhoff
Reg. No. 37,683
(509) 944-4738

Colin D. Barnitz
Reg. No. 35061